



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,948	11/06/2000	Babak Hodjat	DEJI 1001-1	6014
22470 7	590 12/29/2003		EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP			ZHEN, LI B	
P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	10
			DATE MAILED: 12/29/200	DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_	PRE				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
P.	09/706,948	HODJAT, BABAK				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Li B. Zhen	2126				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{03}$	<u> October 2003</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a l 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). ist of the certified copies not estic priority under 35 U.S.C. first sentence of the specific provisional application has b estic priority under 35 U.S.C.	pplication No received in this National Stage received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific				
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s 	5) 🔲 Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No. 6,260,059 to Ueno in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,304,864 to Liddy.

As to claim 1, Ueno teaches a subject message [messages] for use with a network of agents [knowledge provider agents which are mutually connected for exchange of messages; column 10, lines 60 – 67] each having a view of its own domain of responsibility [knowledge base and/or rule base information relating to any particular subject, stored at a knowledge provider agent; col. 2, lines 49 – 54], comprising:

receiving from an upchain agent ["User" is the identifier of the requesting user; column 12, lines 22 - 23] a query [a string "ask", signifying that this is an information request message; column 12, lines 20 - 25] inquiring whether at least part of the subject message is within the domain of responsibility of the first agent [a message matching section 102-1 which is capable of registering a received message... and which compares first the entire message, then specific parts of the message, with predetermined parts of data which are held in the script storage section 103; column 11, lines 10 - 40];

Art Unit: 2126

querying at least one agent downchain [propagation destination agents] of the first agent whether the queried agent considers at least part of the subject message [col. 11, lines 10 - 40] to be in the queried agent's domain of responsibility [the received message are supplied to the propagation message generating section 104, which originates a propagation message... containing the received message contents but is addressed to each of a predetermined plurality of other ones of the agents... such predetermined other ones of the agents will be referred to in the following as the propagation destination agents; column 11, lines 49 - 60];

responding to the upchain agent tentatively whether at least part of the subject message is within the domain of responsibility of the first agent [agentA generates a response message addressed to the requesting user, containing the information that has been requested; col. 13, lines 1 – 15; see Fig. 2] before the first agent receives all responses from the agents downchain of the first agent [agentC achieves successful matching of the message contents... it generates a response message that is addressed to the agent which originated the received propagation message; col. 12, line 20 – col. 13, line 15; see Fig. 2]. Examiner notes that the first agent [agentA] does not receive all responses from all the downchain agents [agentB does not send a response to agentA] before it sends a responds to the upchain agent [user]. Ueno teaches [col. 2, lines 49 – 54] an agent that contains knowledge base and/or rule base information relating to any particular subject, but does not specifically teach a natural language interpretation.

However, Liddy teaches deriving user intent from a subject message [natural language processor enables the agent server to determine the subject categories and

Art Unit: 2126

important terms of the query; col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 20] and agents having a view of its own natural language interpretation domain [trains this neural network in accordance with test patterns based on the natural language processed query, and then embeds the neural network in each of the crawler and meta-search agents; col. 4, lines 1 - 60].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of agents having a view of its own natural language interpretation domain as taught by Liddy to the invention of Ueno because this allows for the retrieving information from the Internet using multiple intelligent agents and natural language processing of the query for building the artificial neural network for the agents, and natural language processing of the retrieved documents to be applied to the artificial neural network of agents [col. 3, lines 28 - 36 of Liddy].

As to claim 5, Ueno as modified teaches processing a subject message by a network of agents including an originating agent of the originating agent, each agent in the network having a view of its own natural language interpretation domain [see the rejection to claim 1 above], comprising:

querying at least one of the agents downchain [propagation destination agents; column 11, lines 49 – 60 of Ueno] of the originating agent in the network a first time, whether the queried agent considers at least part of the subject message to be in the queried agent's natural language interpretation domain [see claim 1 above], the first query including a first depth-of-search indication ["Count" is a number whose initial value determines the number of agents from which response information sets are to be obtained; column 21, lines 40 – 67 of Ueno];

Art Unit: 2126

resolving any conflicting responses from the queried agents to identify a prevailing one of the downchain agents to whom the subject message should be passed [each agent 600 includes a processing information request message generating section 507; column 20, line 61 – column 21, line 13 of Ueno]; and

instructing the prevailing agent to handle at least part of the subject message [If agentC achieves successful matching of the message contents with its script and thereby obtains the necessary response information set, it generates a response message that is addressed to the agent which originated the received propagation message; column 12, lines 54 – 60 of Ueno].

As to claim 11, Ueno as modified teaches processing a subject message by a network of agents including an originating agent and at least one agent downchain of the originating agent, each agent in the network having a view of its own natural language interpretation domain [see the rejection to claim 1 above], comprising:

querying at least one of the agents downchain [propagation destination agents; column 11, lines 49 – 60 of Ueno] of the originating agent in the network a first time, whether the queried agent considers at least part of the subject message to be in the queried agent's natural language interpretation domain [see claim 1 above];

subsequently querying the queried agents a second time [re-executing the second matching operation] whether the queried agent considers at least part of the subject message to be in the queried agent's natural language interpretation domain [repetitively executing operations of...when the second matching operation is not successful, reading out one of the alias character strings for one of the data

Art Unit: 2126

fields...replacing a character string which is currently defined for the field in the content format descriptor...and re-executing the second matching operation; col. 6, lines 1-31 of Ueno];

resolving any conflicting responses from the queried agents to identify a prevailing one of the downchain agents to whom at least part of the subject message should be passed [each agent 600 includes a processing information request message generating section 507; column 20, line 61 – column 21, line 13 of Ueno]; and

instructing the prevailing agent to handle at least part of the subject message [If agentC achieves successful matching of the message contents with its script and thereby obtains the necessary response information set, it generates a response message that is addressed to the agent which originated the received propagation message; column 12, lines 54 – 60 of Ueno].

As to claim 2, Ueno as modified teaches the first agent responding further to the upchain agent whether at least part of the subject message is within the natural language interpretation domain of the first agent, after the first agent receives at least one additional response from the agents downchain of the first agent [agentC achieves successful matching of the message contents with its script and thereby obtains the necessary response information set, it generates a response message that is addressed to the agent which originated the received propagation message...when this message is received by agentA, that agent generates a response message addressed to the requesting user; column 12, line 54 - column 13, lines 10 of Ueno].

Art Unit: 2126

As to claims 3 and 4, Ueno as modified teaches the first agent responding in response to a second query received by the first agent from the upchain agent inquiring whether at least part of the subject message is within the natural language interpretation domain of the first agent [matching success is achieved for each of said first, second and third matching operations, generating a response message having said response information set as the content portion thereof and having the sender identifier of said received request message as the destination identifier thereof, and transmitting said response message via said network; column 3, lines 39 – 56 of Ueno].

As to claims 6 and 10, Ueno teaches determining whether a depth of the first agent [count value] exceeds the depth-of search indication [threshold value], and if so, disclaiming the subject message [since the count value at this stage reached the threshold value, agent2 will generate a response message conveying all of the appended response information sets, to be sent back to the "Sender" identified in the information collection message; column 23, lines 14 – 21].

As to claims 7 and 13, Ueno as modified teaches determining whether at least part of the subject message is within the first agent's natural language interpretation domain [see claim 1], and if so, returning a response to the originating agent claiming at least part of the message [agent1...executes the next line of the script, and so performs successive Rule and Knowledge matching processing as described for the first embodiment, to obtain the response information set; column 22, lines 18 – 50 of Ueno].

As to claims 8 and 15, Ueno as modified determining whether at least part of the subject message is within the first agent's natural language interpretation domain [see

Art Unit: 2126

claim 1], and where the subject message is not within the first agent's natural language interpretation domain but the first agent has further agents downchain of the first agent, querying at least one of the further agents whether the further agent considers at least part of the subject message to be in the further agent's natural language interpretation domain [if as a result of the matching processing it is found that the required knowledge information is not available, then the contents of the received message are supplied to the propagation message generating section 104, which originates a propagation message... addressed to each of a predetermined plurality of other ones of the agents; column 11, lines 48 – 62 of Ueno]

As to claim 9, see the rejection to claim 11.

As to claim 12, Ueno teaches the prevailing agent is a community of agents [a plurality of knowledge provider agents; column 3, lines 1 - 15].

As to claim 14, Ueno as modified teaches determining whether at least part of the subject message is within the first agent's natural language interpretation domain [see claim 1], and where the subject message is not within the first agent's natural language interpretation domain and the first agent has no further downchain agents, returning a response to the originating agent disclaiming the subject message [if complete matching is not successful...aliases contained in the Expansion segment are to be successively inserted into predetermined fields of the content format descriptor in the Rule segment, with the matching processing being sequentially repeated using these aliases until complete matching successful is achieved or all of the aliases have been tried; column 24, lines 50 – 60 of Ueno].

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 16, Ueno teaches providing to each of the queried agents a first depth-of-search indication for the subject message [information collection request message having the format: "ask_all(User,Agent,Count,Order)"..."Count" is a number whose initial value determines the number of agents from which response information sets are to be obtained; column 21, lines 52 – 67], and wherein the step of querying a second time comprises the step of providing to each of the queried agents a second depth-of-search indication for the subject message, the second depth-of-search indication a deeper search than the first depth-of-search indication [the value of Count is decremented by 1, i.e. NewCount takes the value 1 (step S6 in FIG. 23). In that case, the next portion of the script is executed to generate an information collection message to be sent to one propagation destination agent; column 22, lines 33 – 50].

As to claim 17, this is a combination of claims 13 and 15; note the rejections to claims 13 and 15 above.

As to claim 18, Ueno teaches receiving a group of at least one response [response information set] from the further agents downchain of the first agent, in response to the step of querying the further agents [agentC achieves successful matching of the message contents with its script and thereby obtains the necessary response information set, it generates a response message that is addressed to the agent which originated the received propagation message; column 12, line 54 – column 13, line 10], and returning a response to the originating agent in response to the step of receiving [when this message is received by agentA, that agent generates a response message addressed to the requesting user; column 12, line 54 - column 13, line 10].

Art Unit: 2126

Page 10

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the "count" of Ueno is not the same as the "depth-of-search" indication of the present application because the "depth-of-search...indicates the maximum number of agents that a query search should be sent through along a chain regardless of which ones provides a response" [p. 16, lines 4 – 8]. The examiner respectfully disagrees because the "count" of Ueno clearly indicates the maximum number of agents that a query search should be sent through [since the count value at this stage reached the threshold value, agent2 will generate a response message; col. 23, lines 15 – 20] and since the agents of Ueno are arranged as a chain of agents [see Fig. 2] the "count" of Ueno also indicates a depth-of-search.

Art Unit: 2126

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Li B. Zhen Examiner Art Unit 2126

lbz December 22, 2003

> THOMAS LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100